

### **REMARKS**

On January 12, 2006, an Amendment was filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed October 14, 2005. On February 1, 2006, an Advisory Action was sent by the PTO in reply to the Amendment filed January 12, 2006. The Advisory Action indicated that the proposed amendments of the January 12<sup>th</sup> Amendment would not be entered. Upon receipt of the Advisory Action, Applicants' undersigned representative spoke with Examiner Blouin and explained why the proposed amendments should have been entered. Examiner Blouin was in agreement, and thus, on February 21, 2006, a Supplemental Advisory Action was mailed by the PTO indicating that the proposed amendments filed January 12, 2006, will be entered, and that the rejections will be maintained.

On page 2 of the Supplemental Advisory Action, it is briefly explained why the rejections will be maintained. However, in this explanation there is an inconsistency in that a first embodiment of EP '625 (Figs. 1-4(d)) is used to address some of the limitations of claim 1, while a second embodiment of EP '625 (Figs. 5-7) is used to address additional limitations of claim 1. Specifically, in rejecting claim 1 over EP '625 the fulcrum supporting member 21 of Figs. 5-7 has been equated to the claimed "resilient member", and in order to address the claimed "L2/L1" relationship Applicants' attention was directed to the drawing provided with the Office Action mailed April 4, 2005, which drawing depicts Examiner Blouin's explanation as to why the embodiment represented by Figs. 1-4(d) meets the claimed "L2/L1" relationship. However, the fulcrum supporting member 21 is only found in the embodiment represented by Figs. 5-7, and it is not seen how the "L2/L1" relationship can be found in this embodiment.

Accordingly, because there is no single embodiment of EP '625 that teaches or suggests each of the limitations as recited in claim 1, and because no explanation has been provided as to how or why either of the embodiments EP '625 could be modified so as to include the missing limitations thereof, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over EP '625, whereby claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11-13 are allowable over this reference.

Additionally, the Remarks provided as part of the January 12<sup>th</sup> Amendment are hereby repeated. Thus, claim 14 is also believed to be allowable over EP '625, because this reference

does not teach or suggest that "said supporting arm is interconnected with said base arm **only** by said resilient member". In this regard, as shown in the embodiment of Figs. 5-7 of EP '625, the supporting arm 11 is interconnected to the base arm 15 by screws 16. As such, the supporting arm of EP '625 is not interconnected with the base arm only by the resilient member 21, as required by claim 14. Thus, claims 14-21 are also allowable over EP '625.


If the Examiner continues to reject the claims, then the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically identify those features of EP '625 that are being read on each claim limitation.

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing these remarks, the Examiner believes that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideki KUWAJIMA et al.

By: 

Joseph M. Gorski  
Registration No. 46,500  
Attorney for Applicants

JMG/nka  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
March 14, 2006